

From: Sent: Todd Hutchinson [jth@twcny.rr.com] Monday, February 13, 2006 12:52 AM

To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein

Subject: 05-311

FCC Comissioners

Re: MB Docket No. 05-311.

In considering the issues surrounding 05-311, I would urge the commissioners to consider the balance between the positive effects of competition and the public interest.

In our rapidly developing media environment, the ability of the public to access channels of delivery must be given priority consideration over commercial interest. Our democratic system depends on open and free communications, and open access local public channels (the right of citizen control and access to bandwidth) form an essential component of this 'public square' communication.

Local franchising authority has protected these interests for years. In considering 05-311, it is incumbent on the commission to ensure that those interests remain fully protected and secure, and where possible to expand on them by broadly applying and enhancing existing precedent in the public interest as new media delivery mechanisms and forms continue to evolve.

Todd Hutchinson Trumansburg, NY

No. of Cooles reold List ABCDE

05-311

From: Steve Meisner [steve.meisner@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 2:00 PM

To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate

Cc: John Norton; Andrew Long

Subject: MB Docket No. 05-311 - Protect local cable access

Dear Chairman Martin and Commissioners Copps, Adelstein & Tate:

I am writing you to express our strong support for media democracy. I support Public, Education and Government Access (PEG) resources which our community receives as a result of local cable/video franchises. I am concerned that none of the national video bills before Congress offer enough channels or bandwidth for public use. I am also concerned that financial support for use of community channels is either inadequate or needs more protection than what is described in these bills.

I believe in community media. It provides coverage of local government activities. It provides a forum for important community discussions. It gives our neighbors a face and a voice. It provides an important sense of meaning in a fast moving, complex world. It allows citizens to be producers of information, not just consumers.

As my representative, I ask that you:

- 1 Please make sure that any changes in the local franchise for video and information to the home include enough community bandwidth for now and in the future.
- 2 Please be sure that any legislation includes direct financial support for public use of these resources.
- 3 Please keep public access local. Local needs and interests are best determined by public officials and citizens where they live, not hundreds, if not thousands, of miles away.

This issue is fundamentally about control. I believe individuals and governments at the local level are in the best position to define local franchise terms and conditions and local interests and needs – programmatically, economically, and administratively. The issue is ultimately one of self-governance.

Thank you very much for your considerations.

Sincerely,

Steve Meisner 136 Woodland Circle North Aurora, IL 60542

> No. of Copies recid 0 List ABODE

05-311

From:

ronlundmark [ronlundmark@comcast.net]

Sent:

Friday, February 10, 2006 6:04 PM

To:

KJMWEB

Subject: Media de-regulation

Dear Mr. Martin,

I have worked in advertising for over 30 years. I own a small ad agency in Cleveland, Ohio and have clients in Nashville, TN, Columbus, Cleveland and Cincinnati, OH, Indianapolis, Ft. Wayne, IN and Detroit, Ml. I've had clients all over the US in the past. I buy media time on radio, TV and cable.

When the 1996 de-regulation of the radio industry came about, I was mad that the FCC didn't take into account what would happen to the industry's workers.

Example; The Sarasota/Bradenton/Venice, Florida market. There were about 9 radio stations, most independently owned. Clearchannel bought the six most powerful stations and consolidated them into one building leaving three leased buildings vacant.

They, collectively, went from having nine receptionists to two. They went from six engineers to two. Each station had around seven sales reps to equal about 35. That number went down to around 8. Four sales managers became one. Four General managers became one. Because of syndicated Clearchannel shows, I'm not sure how many local on-air personnel were lost over a few years. They went from having 6 creative producers to one. How about the janitors and security people out of a job?

To be stingy, the consolidation of those stations caused the loss of over 50 <u>permanent</u> job losses and vacated three buildings (when it happens downtown in a big city like Cleveland, Ohio, that's a big loss). They also lost many local voices vital to any community. Then, to top it off, they raised the ad rates to recover the cost of buying the stations causing widespread INFLATION.

Now multiply that by all the markets and big markets in the country and you come up with a staggering amount of permanent job losses and big inflation. And for what reason was the law changed to allow this?

As I see it, none of those owners of radio stations were poor. In fact, I've never met a station owner that was poor. When they sold their stations it made them even wealthier.

The ONLY reason to completely change and de-regulate IS TO MAKE A FEW PEOPLE VERY WEALTHY. The radio station personnel I do business with still hate what the FCC has done to our profession. It wasn't broke, but the FCC figured they'd fix it anyway to appease the lobbyists and stuff money into their campaign funds.

I am a conservative Republican. If you decide to de-regulate the TV stations and cable companies, we will have thousands and thousand of permanent job losses just to make a few people even wealthier.

Please	consider	me when	you have	people	testify	as to the	sanity	of this	de-regu	lation.
									3.5	Al Breeze

Sincerely,

List ABCDE

Ron Lundmark Auto Ads, Inc. 576 Edinborough Dr. Bay Village, OHIO 44140 216-780-5626

05-311

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Karen Johnson [kajesq@cablespeed.com]

Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 11:31 AM

To: KJMWEB

Cc: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate

Subject: Preservation of funding for local PEG Access television stations

TO: Chairman Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein, and

Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate

I am a member of the PEG Access Advisory Board for PTTV, local channels 47 and 48 in Port Townsend, Washington. PTTV has continuously broadcast local public, school and government programs since 1998. The most watched program is our local council meetings. Because of PTTV the elderly, the disabled, the infirm and parents who must stay home with their children have access to council meetings, which are rebroadcast several times after their initial live bi-monthly broadcast. The Port Townsend School District Superintendent has a regular program where he informs the public of current matters. Most of the non-profit organizations in Jefferson County have participated in programs to inform the public of their missions. Jefferson Healthcare, our local hospital, provides educational programming to inform the public of various health issues and preventative health care. The motto of PTTV is "Community through Communication" and that is exactly what PTTV has provided our city and county residents for the past 8 years.

After the Seattle earthquake of February 26, 2001 I immediately turned to PTTV to find out what damage had occurred in our LOCAL community. PTTV was the only immediate access the public had to what had happened in our own area. Several years ago an Alzheimer's patient disappeared in the middle of the night. The police called the station manager, Gary Lemons at his home and he immediately broadcast the information regarding this missing person. She was found before the sun came up. I could go on and on, but I think you realize just how important access to the public airwaves is to our community. Please do everything you can to steward those airwaves and assure that we maintain funding through Franchise Agreements. Thank you for your consideration of this very important matter,

Sincerely,

Karen Nelson

No. of Corpes recid List ABODE

05-311

From: Sent:

JT Rockville [jtrockville@yahoo.com]

Monday, February 13, 2006 9:08 AM

To:

doug@dougduncan.com; douglas.duncan@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; dbreisch@rockvillemd.gov;

briana.gowing@verizon.com

Cc: Subject: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate

Verizon's Fiber to the Premise

To All Whom It May Concern:

In Rockville's April 2005 newsletter, the city indicated that they will not issue the permits necessary for Verizon to upgrade their facilities, because they feel an additional franchise is necessary. However in June, a New York State court ruled that Verizon does not need an additional franchise for this type of upgrade. I realize that Maryland is not bound by the New York decision, but the logic from that decision directly applies to the situation in Rockville. I suspect Verizon could win a lawsuit in Maryland if they chose to fight Rockville's decision, but I doubt they want to incur the legal expenses. As far as I know, no other jurisdiction in the county, the state, or the country, has taken the same stance as the City of Rockville regarding Verizon's upgrade.

Rockville's decision to deny permits affects many people in the county even those who do not reside within the city limits. For example, Randolph Hills is not in the city limits. The Verizon office on Montrose Road, which serves Randolph Hills, is not within the city limits. But since the Montrose Road office also serves areas within city limits, residents of Randolph Hills cannot be upgraded. I do not vote for the officials in the City of Rockville, yet their decision on this matter is preventing me from an upgrade that would reduce my costs several hundred dollars per month.

Nearly a year has passed since Rockville decided to deny permits for Verizon's upgrade, yet no progress has been made to reach an agreement. As far as I know, the county has not taken any steps to intervene.

At a Long Branch Town Hall meeting, I asked Councilmember George Leventhal about progress with television franchise negotiations. He wasn't aware of any. I wrote to my Councilmember, Howard Denis, asking if any progress has been made. He did not reply. I wrote to County Executive Doug Duncan asking who is in charge of negotiations. He did not reply. This issue is too important to be ignored!

This past November, the FCC announced that they are reconsidering the rules governing our communications policy, citing the unreasonableness of some local jurisdictions. Normally, I would be in favor of local control. However, the situation in Rockville provides a perfect argument in favor of removing local control.

The FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is here: http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-05-189A1.doc

Rockville's April 2005 newsletter is here: http://www.rockvillemd.gov/residents/rockvillereports/2005/0405.htm

The State of New York's decision is here: http://www3.dps.state.ny.us/pscweb/WebFileRoom.nsf/ArticlesByCategory/47087F3DE582BAE88525 7021005DEA7C/\$File/05m0250.06.15.05.pdf?OpenElement

I sincerely hope that all of you will work together so that Verizon's fiber to the premise project can proceed as quickly as possible. If you don't, we can (and should) expect federal intervention, and/or state control.

Regards, Jaime Todaro 11109 Troy Road Rockville, MD 20852 301-770-4038

No. of Occies recid 0 List ABODE